

Serial No.: 09/763,246
Examiner: Hassan A. Phillips
Title: METHOD FOR USING A WHOLE DIGIT CODE TO ASSIGN AN ADDRESS TO A COMPUTER
Page 5 of 8

REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants appreciate the courtesy shown by the Examiner in discussing this application with Applicants' representative Rong Yang on March 11, 2008. The above amendments and the following remarks reflect the substance of the interview. Claims 1 and 18 have been revised. Support for the revisions can be found in the paragraph bridging pages 1 and 2, and the first full paragraph on page 2 of the specification, among other places. Claims 1, 6 and 8-18 remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 6 and 8-16 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Kelly (US 6,594,254). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for assigning a unique full digital code address (FDCA) to an online computer, which is used to replace IP address-domain name address coding solutions. Claim 1 requires assigning to an online computer a unique full digital code address (FDCA). Claim 1 also requires an online number that includes the digital number of an established network site, which number is specified by the country or area.

IP addresses and domain names are conventionally used to identify a computer that is connected to the Internet. An IP address is easy for machines to identify but difficult for humans to remember. With the expansion of the network, a domain name for identifying an online computer has also become more and more complex and sometimes difficult to remember. See Background of the Art and Summary of the Invention of the specification, among other places. The invention recited in claim 1 provides a simple and alternative manner to browse the Internet, which is easy for a user to remember and administer, while allowing each assigned address of an online computer to be unique. See the second full paragraph on page 3 of the specification, among other places. In addition, the method recited in claim 1 allows assigning not only a fixed static address to each online computer, but also a dynamic address to any temporary online computer. See one of the embodiments in the paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6 of the specification, among other places.

Serial No.: 09/763,248

Examiner: Hassan A. Phillips

Title: METHOD FOR USING A WHOLE DIGIT CODE TO ASSIGN AN ADDRESS TO A COMPUTER

Page 6 of 8

More specifically, for example, instead of assigning an online computer with a specific IP address and a conventional domain name, e.g., www.aaa.com, a full digital code address, e.g., 00161212345671, including country code 001, area code 612, telephone number 1234567, and category number 1, may be assigned to replace the IP address, while the conventional domain name is not even necessary because FDCA can be easily memorized and thus can be used directly. In a network using an FDCA address system, each FDCA in such a network is comparable to an IP address in the Internet.

In the Internet, an IP address is the real address and a domain name is built on the IP address system. Each domain name corresponds to an IP address. As a result, people can find the IP address by a Domain Name System (DNS) server if a domain name is available. Like an IP address in the Internet, each FDCA in the network using the FDCA address system is the real network address and will be used on the network layer of the network architecture.

Kelly fails to disclose assigning to an online computer a unique full digital code address (FDCA), as claimed in claim 1. Rather, Kelly discusses making an email address as a domain name and translating the domain name into an IP address. Kelly, col. 7, line 30 to col. 8, line 8. Kelly also discusses making a telephone number as a part of a domain name and translating the domain name into an IP address. Kelly, col. 12, lines 10-15 and lines 32-38. However, Kelly fails to disclose using the email address or the telephone number to communicate on the network layer. Nothing in Kelly discloses or teaches assigning a FDCA to each online computer as required by claim 1 so as to identify each online computer. Instead, the telephone number in Kelly appears be a part of a domain name for identifying an end user of public switched telephone networks (PSTN). This domain name is then translated into an IP address to be assigned to an online computer. That is to say, the telephone number in Kelly is not a part of an FDCA as required by claim 1.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Kelly. Claims 6 and 8-16 depend from claim 1 and are patentable along with claim 1 and need not be separately distinguished at this time. Applicants are not conceding the relevance of the rejection to the remaining features of the rejected claims.

Serial No.: 09/763,246
Examiner: Hassan A. Phillips
Title: METHOD FOR USING A WHOLE DIGIT CODE TO ASSIGN AN ADDRESS TO A COMPUTER
Page 7 of 8

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 17 depends from claim 1 and is patentable over Kelly for at least the same reasons discussed above regarding claims 1 and 8-16. Applicants are not conceding the relevance of the rejection to the remaining features of the rejected claim.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly in view of Osaku et al. (US 6,061,738). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 18 is patentable over Kelly in view of Osaku et al. for reasons similar to those discussed above. Claim 18 is directed to a method for assigning a unique full digital code address (FDCA) to each of a plurality of computers in a network, which is used to replace IP address-domain name address coding solutions. Claim 18 requires creating the FDCA for each online computer, and allowing the computers in the network to identify each other via the network. Kelly fails to disclose or suggest such method as recited in claim 18. For at least these reasons, claim 18 is patentable over Kelly in view of Osaku et al. Osaku et al. do not remedy the deficiencies of Kelly. Applicants are not conceding the relevance of the rejection to the remaining features of the rejected claim.

Serial No.: 09/763,246
Examiner: Hassan A. Phillips
Title: METHOD FOR USING A WHOLE DIGIT CODE TO ASSIGN AN ADDRESS TO A COMPUTER
Page 8 of 8


In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Rong Yang, Limited Recognition No. L0279, at (612) 455-3816.



Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902-0902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

Dated: March 12, 2008

By: 
Name: Rong Yang
Limited Recognition No.: L0279

CY